

TRANSCRIPT PREPARED BY THE CLERK OF THE LEGISLATURE
Transcriber's Office
FLOOR DEBATE

May 21, 2001

LB 772

contributions were invested and that did have a substantial benefit for the state employees' plan. It is simply not accurate to say that we have done nothing. And, in fact, the plan in general is very close to being an adequate one by the standards that we use for evaluation of the plan, but it isn't quite adequate. Now I think I heard a representation sometime or another that Buck recommended that we do something like what is in this amendment tonight. That isn't quite the case either. If you want to read the study and it's titled "Benefit Review Study of the Nebraska Retirement System" dated August 2000, turn to page 60 and you'll see right there in the middle three little bullet points. The first point that they make is we ought to increase contribution rates to meet adequacy. They say that a total contribution rate to 12 to 13 percent would be sufficient. That's an option. They say that we can add a defined benefit element to improve competitiveness, doesn't have anything to do with benefit adequacy, to improve competitiveness. They say that can be accomplished by a traditional benefit plan or a cash balance plan, which, frankly, in my estimation, would be a better kind of proposal than what we have in front of us. I think that converting all state employees to a cash balance plan would be a good idea and, in fact, I had a bill to do that in 1995; and I still think that's a good idea. They also have another idea about adding a guaranteed income option which amounts to a COLA. So to suggest that somehow this proposal is being driven by something that Buck recommends is not quite the case. And I agree with Senator Bruning that it is not wise to bring this as a supplemental plan for a limited number of employees that are classified as state employees. That simply is not the way to go about developing your plans.

SENATOR CUDABACK: One minute.

SENATOR WICKERSHAM: There are various curiosities about the proposal that is in front of us. One of them I noted about how you would calculate a reduced benefit at various ages and lengths of service. I can't...and so far no one has explained that to me. I don't know if that can be rationalized or justified. The proportional contribution rates that would be called for in this proposal do not seem to square with what we have done in other plans. This supplemental plan calls for a